



On RSA-Based Signature Standards

John Linn

Principal Architect, RSA Laboratories

June 2000



Presentation Goals and Scope

- **Discuss approaches and harmonization for RSA-based signatures:**
 - Various digital signature methods exist:
 - specifics are non-interoperable
 - standardization, adoption, and deployment vary
 - New techniques reflect advancing state-of-art
- **Emphasizing standards aspects, not mathematics or product features**

The Integer Factorization (IF) Family

- Cryptography based on the difficulty of the integer factorization (IF) problem
- Modulus $n = pq$
- Public exponent e , private exponent d
- RSA: e odd
- Rabin-Williams: e even; conditions on p, q
 - outside primary scope of this presentation

IF Public-Key Techniques

- Following IEEE P1363 classification
- *Primitives* are mathematical operations on integers, field elements
- *Schemes* are sets of operations on messages
- Schemes are built up from primitives, “embedding methods” mapping between messages, integers

Notation

M	message (string)
m	message representative (integer)
s	signature (integer)
SP	Signature Primitive ($m \rightarrow s$)
VP	Verification Primitive ($s \rightarrow m$)

Embedding Methods

- Mappings between message M , integer message representative m
 - *Embed*: $M \rightarrow m$
 - *Extract*: $m \rightarrow M$
 - *Check*: M, m consistent?
- Also called “encoding methods”
- Security goals: one-way, collision-resistant, no mathematical structure

Example Schemes in the IF Family

- **Signature schemes with appendix:**
 - ANSI X9.31
 - PKCS #1
 - Bellare-Rogaway PSS
- **Signature schemes with message recovery:**
 - ISO/IEC 9796-1, 9796-2
 - Bellare-Rogaway PSS-R
- **This talk focuses on the first set**

IF Signatures with Appendix

- **Primitives:**
 - SP: $s = m^d \bmod n$
 - VP: $m = s^e \bmod n$
- **Signature operation:**
 - $m = \text{Embed}(M)$
 - $s = \text{SP}(m)$
- **Verification operation:**
 - $m = \text{VP}(s)$
 - $\text{Check}(M, m)$

Contemporary Standards

- **FIPS 186-2**
- **PKCS #1**
- **X9.31**

Status of FIPS 186-2

- **FIPS 186-2, Digital Signature Standard (February, 2000), specifies digital signatures using SHA-1 with several types of public-key cryptography**
 - DSA, specified within FIPS 186-2
 - RSA, via ANSI X9.31 or (until mid-2001) PKCS #1
 - Elliptic Curve DSA via ANSI X9.62
- **NIST-accredited program validates implementations**
 - currently, testing available only for DSA; vendor-affirmed conformance possible for other algorithms
 - validation targets both interoperability and assurance aspects

PKCS #1: Status

- **PKCS #1 v1.5 (November 1993) defines encryption and signature facilities with ad hoc padding**
 - widely adopted in industry, Internet standards
- **PKCS #1 v2.0 (October 1998) defends against encryption attacks (e.g., Bleichenbacher) with Optimal Asymmetric Encryption Padding (OAEP)**
 - being considered for use with some Internet standards
- **PKCS #1 v2.1 (draft, September 1999) provides analogous defense against potential signature attacks with Probabilistic Signature Scheme (PSS)**
- **Availability: <http://www.rsalabs.com>, Internet Informational RFCs 2313 (v1.5), 2437 (v2.0)**

PKCS #1 (v1.5): Format and Usage

- **Embed(M) =**
00 01 ff ... ff 00 || HashAlgID || Hash(M)
- **Ad hoc design**
- **Widely deployed, incorporated in many Internet standards**
 - **PKIX profile**
 - **SSL/TLS certificates**
 - **S/MIME**
- **Being incorporated into IEEE P1363a**

PKCS #1: Signature ASN Elements

- **pkcs-1 OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= { iso(1) member-body(2) us(840) rsadsi(113549) pkcs(1) pkcs-1(1)}**
- **md5WithRSAEncryption OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= { pkcs-1 4 }**
- **sha-1WithRSAEncryption OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= { pkcs-1 5 }**
- **id-RSASSA-PSS OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= { pkcs-1 10 }**
- **RSASSA-PSS-params ::= SEQUENCE {
 hashFunc [0] AlgorithmIdentifier {{oaepDigestAlgorithms}}
 DEFAULT sha1Identifier,
 maskGenFunc [1] AlgorithmIdentifier {{pkcs1MGFAlgorithms}}
 DEFAULT mgf1SHA1Identifier,
 salt OCTET STRING OPTIONAL }**

ANSI X9.31: Status

- Issued September 1998
- Like PKCS #1 v1.5, uses an ad hoc padding scheme
- Availability: purchase from ANSI
- OID (OIW SecSig, X9.57): {1 3 14 3 2 15}, shaWithRSASignature, intended for use with X9.31 padding
- Intent within X9F1 for document to be reopened to incorporate PSS

ANSI X9.31: Format and Usage

- **Embed(M) =**
 - 6b bb ... bb ba || Hash(M) || 3x cc**
 - where $x = 3$ for SHA-1, 1 for RIPEMD-160
- **Ad hoc design**
- **Incorporated in several standards**
 - IEEE P1363, ISO/IEC 14888-3
 - US NIST FIPS 186-1
- **Limited industry and Internet adoption**

X9.31 Constraints on Keys

- **X9.31 requires strong primes, specifies generation techniques**
 - need for strong vs. random primes is controversial
 - adds performance cost and complexity, defends against (some) varieties of trapdoors, particular factoring attacks
- **X9.31 requires modulus sizes in fixed units (1024, 1280, 1536, 1792, 2048, ...)**

ANSI X9.31 vs. PKCS #1: Technical Comparison

- Both are deterministic
- Both include a hash function identifier
- Both are ad hoc designs
 - both resist Coron-Naccache-Stern / Coppersmith-Halevi-Jutla attacks on ISO/IEC 9796-1,-2
- PKCS #1 scope concerns format interoperability; X9.31 also imposes constraints on keys
 - PKCS #1 accepts a superset of the RSA keys allowed by X9.31 constraints

Future Directions

- **Probabilistic Signature Scheme (PSS)**
- **Harmonization: issues, status, and a proposed approach**

Prudent Security

- **What if a weakness is found in ANSI X9.31 or PKCS #1 signatures?**
 - no proof of security, though designs are well motivated, supported by analysis
 - would be surprising — but so was vulnerability in ISO/IEC 9796-1
- **PSS embodies “best practices,” prudent to improve over time**

Bellare-Rogaway PSS

(Probabilistic Signature Scheme, Eurocrypt '96)

- **Embed(M) =**
 $00 \parallel w \parallel [\text{Expand}(w) \oplus (r \parallel 00 \dots 00)]$
 - where $w = \text{Hash}(r \parallel M)$, r random
- **Provably secure design**
- **PSS-R variant supports signature with message recovery**

PSS: Standardization Status

- **Standardization of PSS is being pursued in several forums**
 - To be included in IEEE P1363a, PKCS #1 v2.1
 - Intent within X9F1 to reopen X9.31 to incorporate PSS
 - Intent to include PSS-R in rev. to ISO 9796-2
- **Alignment among forums is ongoing**

Patent Issues

- **No patents reported to IEEE P1363 for ANSI X9.31, PKCS #1 formatting**
- **PSS embedding method is patent pending by University of California**
 - UC agrees to waive licensing on PSS for signatures with appendix if adopted in IEEE standard (June 15, 1999 letter)
 - informal agreement to extend licensing waiver to other standards bodies
 - “reasonable and nondiscriminatory licensing” for signatures with message recovery

Standards vs. Theory vs. Practice

- **ANSI X9.31 is widely standardized**
- **PKCS #1 is widely deployed**
- **PSS is widely considered secure**

- **How to harmonize?**

Challenges

- **Infrastructure changes take time**
 - on the user side
 - in product cycles
- **Specifications vary in scope**
 - complicates modularity among choices
- **Many communities involved**
 - formal standards bodies, IETF, vendors, certificate authorities, validators, ...

Proposed Approach

- **Short term: Continue to support both PKCS #1 and ANSI X9.31 signature formats**
 - e.g., in IETF profiles, FIPS validation
 - continue coexistence until PSS mature, available
- **Longer term: Move toward PSS signatures**
 - not necessarily, but perhaps optionally with “strong primes”
 - upgrade in due course — e.g., along with AES algorithm, new hash functions
- **General: consider decoupling treatment of interoperability vs. assurance characteristics**
 - profile and validate aspects independently?